PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No.:	10/554,031	Confirmation No.:
	7840	
Applicant(s):	David Watt Stevenson	
Filed:	August 16, 2006	
Art Unit:	2175	
Examiner:	Phantana-Angkool, David	
Title:	NAVIGATING THROUGH WEBSITES AND LIKE INFORMATION SOURCES	

Docket No.: 031749/301402
Customer No.: 00826

Filed Via FAX
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Fax: 001 571 273 8300

NOTIFICATION OF PRIOR ART

Sir:

I understand that there is a statutory requirement for me to inform you of any prior art or other relevant information regarding my patent application. In order to company with this, I attach the following examination report from Japan, which may be relevant. Note that the Japan application has now lapsed, and will not be progressed further, although the US application will.

Respectfully submitted,

David W Stevenson
Applicant/Inventor

58 Sheriffs Park,
Linlithgow,
West Lothian
United Kingdom
EH49 7SS

Tel: 01506 847543
Email:davids@companyradar.com

FILED BY FAX TO PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON September 21, 2010.

- 2 -

| Ref.: DP6032 | Dispatch No.: 152222 | Dispatch Date: 3 Mar. '10 | Ref.: DP6032 | Dispatch No.: 152222 | Dispatch Date: 3 Mar. '10 | Dispatch Date: 3 Mar. '10 |

Notification of Reason for Rejection

Patent Application Number: 2006-508172
Drafting Date: 24 February 2010
Examiner of Japanese Patent Office: N. Iwama 9287 5M00
Representative/Applicant: Masayuki Asakura
Applied Provision Patent Law Sections 29(1), 29(2) and 36

This application should be refused for the reason(s) mentioned below. If the applicant has any argument against the reason(s), such argument should be submitted within 3 months from the date on which this notification was dispatched.

Reason A

The subject application does not comply with the requirements under Patent Law Section 36(6)ii on the points mentioned below:

Claims 1 – 12, 13 – 23 and 24

It is perceived that the invention according to claims 1 – 12, 13 – 23, 24 relates to information processing. However, the description of such information processing is excessively functional and abstract, which make the invention unclear.

For example, in claim 1, it is not clear what kind of information processing causes 'deriving a profile of contents of each and every candidate collection' or 'comparing a first candidate profile with each and every other candidate profile to derive a measure of similarity between collection pairs'.

The same unclearness appears in dependent claims of claim 1. In addition, the same objection is applied to other claims mentioned above. In particular, although claims 5 and 17 further defines claims 1 and 13, the definition of information processing is too functional and abstract, which makes the invention unclear.

Claims 1, 13, 24

In claim 1, the phrase 'identifying a list of candidate collections of information such as websites; deriving a profile of the contents of each and every o candidate profile with each and every other candidate profile to derive a measure of similarity between collections pairs, and presenting a plurality of identifie,' makes the technical sense of the invention unclear.

Similarly, the phrase of claim 13, 'identifying a list of candidate collections of information such as websites; deriving a profile of the contents of each and every

-1-

candidate profile with each and every other candidate profile to derive a measure of similarity between collections pairs, and presenting a plurality of identifiers' and that of claim 24, 'presenting identifiers for identifying one or more candidate collections together with an indication or measure of similarity between the desired profile and each candidate profile' are unclear.

Claims 1 – 12

It is unclear if the invention according to claims 1 – 12 relates to either a step of operation performed by a human using a computer or an automated information processing system by computer software.

Thereby, it appears that the subject matter of the invention contains two different concepts, that is, 'method for operating a computational tool, that is, a computer' and 'method for information processing by using computer software', which makes the invention unclear.

Consequently, the invention of claims 1 – 12, 13 – 23, and 24 is not clear.

Reason B

The invention(s) in the claims listed below of the subject application should not be qualified to be an industrially applicable invention defined in Patent Law Section 29(1).

Claims 1 – 12, 24

As mentioned in Reason A, the invention of claims 1 – 12 and 24 can be deemed as 'method for operating a computational tool, that is, a computer' and 'method for information processing by using computer software'. If the former is the case, as it is considered as a human-induced arrangement. If the latter is the case, as the invention does not comprise any specific hardware resources, such as a memory, it is not considered that information processing by software is implemented by hardware resources.

Claim 13 – 23

As the invention of claims 13 – 23 does not comprise specific hardware resources such as a memory, it does not appear that information processing by software is implemented by hardware resources.

Consequently, the invention of claims 1 – 12, 13 – 23, and 24 does not comply with the requirements under Patent Law Section 29(1).

Reason C

The invention(s) in the claims listed below of the subject application should not be

-2-

Ref.: DP6032   Dispatch No.: 152222   Dispatch Date: 3 Mar. '10

granted a patent under the provision of Patent Law Section 29(2) since it could have easily been made by persons who have common knowledge in the technical field to which the invention(s) pertains, on the basis of the invention(s) described in the publication listed below which was distributed in Japan or foreign countries prior to the filing of the subject application.

Cited References

D1: Abe J, et. al., *Text Data Mining: Applications to Browsing Large Document Collections and Web Data*, Journal of Artificial Intelligence, Japan, 01 July 2000, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp 618 – 628

D2: Yu D, et. al., *Topic Extraction from Bulletin Board System in Community Webs*, FIT 2002, Institute of Electronics, Information and Communication Engineers, Japan, 13 September 2002, pp 115 – 116

Remarks

As mentioned above, although the invention according to claims 1 – 12, 13 – 23, 24 is not clear, the following points should be addressed:

D1 describes the technique of dialogical document searching in which a patter is extracted from a group of documents and subsequently selecting key works of the pattern for an exploratory document browsing (in particular, 5.5 Experiment 3: Dialogical document browsing).

D2 discloses clustering of a topic by using a feature vector that utilizes importance of the phrase that includes such a topic. It is considered that the feature vector of D2 is a certain type of contents profile. In addition, according to D2, calculation processing of importance using vector appears to include counting the number of topics that are common to the profiles.

Therefore, it is considered that a person skilled in the art could have easily achieved the invention of claims 1 – 12, 13 – 23, 24 on the basis of the common knowledge and the techniques disclosed in D1 and D2.

If any new reason(s) for refusal is found, another office action will be issued.

-3-